1	BILAL A. ESSAYLI	
2	Acting United States Attorney JOSEPH T. MCNALLY Assistant United States Attorney Acting Chief, Criminal Division IAN V. YANNIELLO (Cal. Bar No. 265481) GREGORY W. STAPLES (Cal. Bar No. 155505) DANIEL H. WEINER (Cal. Bar No. 329025) Assistant United States Attorneys	
3		
4		
5		
	1400/1500 United States Courthouse	
6	312 North Spring Street Los Angeles, California 90012	
7	Telephone: (213) 894-3667/3535/0813 Facsimile: (213) 894-0142	
8	E-mail: ian.yanniello@usdoj.gov greg.staples@usdoj.gov	
9	daniel.weiner@usdoj.gov	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13		
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CR 24-621(B)-MWF
15	Plaintiff,	ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL DATE AND FINDINGS REGARDING EXCLUDABLE TIME
16	V.	PERIODS PURSUANT TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
17	DURK BANKS, et al.,	
	Defendants.	TRIAL DATE: 01/20/2026, 8:30 a.m.
18		PRETRIAL CONFERENCE DATE:
19		01/07/2026, 10:00 a.m.
20		
21	The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding	
22	Request for (1) Continuance of Trial Date and (2) Findings of	

The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding
Request for (1) Continuance of Trial Date and (2) Findings of
Excludable Time Periods Pursuant to Speedy Trial Act, filed by the
parties in this matter. The Court hereby finds that the Stipulation,
which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order,
demonstrates facts that support a continuance of the trial date in
this matter, and provides good cause for a finding of excludable time
pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

## Case 2:24-cr-00621-MWF Document 222 Filed 09/17/25 Page 2 of 4 Page ID #:1301

The Court further finds that: (i) the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and defendant in a speedy trial; (ii) failure to grant the continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice; (iii) the case is so unusual and so complex, due to the nature of the prosecution and the number of defendants that it is unreasonable to expect preparation for pre-trial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy Trial Act; and (iv) failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defendant continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

## THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN:

- 1. The trial in this matter is continued from October 14, 2025, to January 20, 2026, at 8:30 a.m. The Court sets the following pretrial schedule:
  - a. Expert disclosure deadline:
    - i. Government disclosure<sup>1</sup>: September 1, 2025
    - ii. Defense disclosure: November 3, 2025
- b. Pretrial motions other than motions in limine or motions regarding experts:
  - i. Motions due: October 6, 2025
  - ii. Oppositions due: October 27, 2025
  - iii. Optional replies due: November 10, 2025

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  The government may promptly supplement its disclosure and/or notice one or more rebuttal experts based on disclosures made by the defense on November 1, 2025.

iv. Pretrial Motions Hearing: November 18, 2025, 1 2 10:00 a.m. 3 Government's disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. C. 404(b): November 17, 2025 4 Motions in limine, including motions regarding 5 d. 6 experts: 7 i. Motions due: December 8, 2025 8 ii. Oppositions due: December 22, 2025 9 iii. Pretrial Conference/MIL Hearing: January 7, 2026, 10 10:00 a.m. The time period from the date the stipulation to continue 11 2. was filed to January 20, 2026, inclusive, is excluded in computing 12 the time within which the trial must commence, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 13 14 §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (h)(7)(B)(i), (h)(7)(B)(ii), (h)(7)(B)(iv), and 15 (h)(6). 16 The court further finds that defendant DURK BANKS 17 ("defendant BANKS") is joined for trial with codefendants as to whom 18 the time for trial has not run and no motion for severance has been 19 granted. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(6), the time period from 20 the date the stipulation to continue was filed to January 20, 2026, 21 inclusive, constitutes a reasonable period of delay for defendant 22 BANKS, who is joined for trial with codefendants as to whom the time 23 for trial has not run and no motion for severance has been granted. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other 24 25 provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time 26 periods are excluded from the period within which trial must 27 commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of

the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of

## 

additional time periods from the period within which trial must commence. IT IS SO ORDERED. September 17, 2025 DATE United States District Judge Presented by: <u>/s/</u> DANIEL H. WEINER Assistant United States Attorney